



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,693	08/11/2003	Perry Wade Schoneboom	23077-00002	1692
27144	7590	09/19/2005	EXAMINER	
FOSTER, SWIFT, COLLINS & SMITH, P.C. 313 SOUTH WASHINGTON SQUARE LANSING, MI 48933			EPPS, TODD MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3632	

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/604,693	Applicant(s) SCHONEBOOM, PERRY WADE	
	Examiner Todd M. Epps	Art Unit 3632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,5,12-14,19-25,27 and 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-11,15-18,26 and 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/11/2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is the first Office Action for serial number 10/604,693, Support Bracket, filed on August 11, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 11, 16, 26, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,853,066 to Gohn.

Gohn '066 discloses a bracket assembly (fig. 3) comprising a plurality of mounting brackets (24) each having a first end (near 26) adapted to be secured to a vertically extending object having an outer perimeter, and a second end (fig. 3) adapted to be mounted in a position horizontally spaced away from the outer perimeter, the second end including means for supporting a hanging item, the mounting brackets adapted to be spaced around the perimeter, and a load supporting member (18) adapted to be positioned encircling and spaced a horizontal distance around the object, with an unobstructed space encircling object between an object and a load supporting member (fig. 2), wherein the load supporting member being connected to each of the mounting brackets and vertically displaced above the first ends thereof, and being unsupported on a vertically extending object at any point above the elevation of a

Art Unit: 3632

loading support member, wherein the load supporting member comprises a plurality of parts connected together, wherein the mounting brackets are adjustably connected to the supporting member, wherein hook brackets (fig. 3) connects each of the mounting brackets to the supporting member, wherein the hook brackets are adjustably connected to the mounting brackets, wherein the mounting brackets are forced against an object when an item is hung from the supporting member/bracket assembly, wherein the supporting member includes at least one extending bracket (fig. 3) connected to the mounting bracket, wherein the mounting bracket includes a holding member/protrusion (26), wherein the first end of the mounting brackets are below the supporting member, wherein each bracket is connected to the load supporting member at a point displaced from the first end.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,290,504 to Cuba.

Cuba '504 discloses a bracket assembly (fig.1) comprising a plurality of mounting brackets (24) each having a first end (fig. 2) adapted to be secured to a vertically extending object having an outer perimeter, and a second end (fig. 2) adapted to be mounted in a position horizontally spaced away from the outer perimeter, the second end including means for supporting a hanging item, the mounting brackets adapted to be spaced around the perimeter, and a load supporting member (fig. 1) adapted to be positioned encircling and spaced a horizontal distance around the object, the load supporting member being connected to each of the mounting brackets and vertically

Art Unit: 3632

displaced from the first ends thereof (fig. 1), and being unsupported on a vertically extending object at any point above the elevation of a loading support member.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gohn '066 in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,854,293 to Riblet.

Regarding claim 3, Gohn '066 teaches the previous invention wherein the supporting member includes a plurality of parts connected together, but fails to specifically teach the plurality of parts to be threadably connected. Nevertheless, Riblet '293 teaches the well-known concept of pivotally attaching two members via a threaded connection (column 2, lines 64-65). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have threadably connected the plurality of parts since doing so is a well known method in the art to pivotally connect two objects in addition to allowing for the objects to be quickly detached for repair or replacement.

With respect to claim 9, Gohn '066 teaches the previous invention wherein each hook bracket is pivotally connected to the supporting member, but fails to specifically

Art Unit: 3632

teach each hook bracket to be threadably connected to the supporting member.

Nevertheless, Riblet '293 teaches the well-known concept of pivotally attaching two members via a threaded connection (column 2, lines 64-65). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have threadably connected the hook brackets to the supporting member since doing so is a well known method in the art to pivotally connect two objects in addition to allowing for the objects to be quickly detached for repair or replacement.

Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuba '504 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,355,974 to Miller.

Cuba '504 reveals the previous invention failing to specifically teach the mounting bracket(s) to include a holding member adapted to contact the vertical object that includes a nail. Nevertheless, Miller '974 teaches a bracket assembly comprising at least one mounting bracket, and a supporting member connected to the mounting bracket, wherein the mounting bracket includes a holding member/nail (16). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a holding member/nail on the mounting bracket(s) of Cuba '504 as in Miller '974 so as to provide for superior mounting of the mounting brackets on a vertically extending object.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gohn '066 in view of Miller, Jr. '896.

Gohn '066 reveals the previous invention failing to specifically teach the holding member to include a rubber pad. Nevertheless, Miller, Jr. '896 discloses a bracket

Art Unit: 3632

assembly comprising at least one mounting bracket, and a supporting member connected to the mounting bracket, wherein the mounting bracket includes a holding member/rubber pad (see column 2, line 56). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the holding member of Gohn '066 to be a rubber pad as in Miller, Jr. '896 so as to provide for superior mounting of the mounting brackets on a vertically extending object while preventing marring of the vertically extending object.

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gohn '066 in view of U.S. Patent number 6,725,972 to Krier et al (Krier).

Gohn '066 discloses the previous invention failing to specifically teach the first ends of the mounting brackets to each include a tooth adapted to contact the object. Nevertheless, Krier '972 teaches a bracket assembly comprising a mounting bracket and a load supporting member, wherein the first end of the mounting bracket includes a tooth (9) adapted to contact an object. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the first end of the mounting brackets of Gohn '066 to have a tooth as in Krier '972 so as to provide for superior mounting of the mounting brackets to the vertically extending object.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 6, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-11, 15-18, 26, and 29-31 have been considered, however the references or prior arts listed above have all the elements shown in the applicant's claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Todd M. Epps whose telephone number is 571-272-8282. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on 571-272-6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3632

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Todd M. Epps
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3632
September 13, 2005

 9/15/05
ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600